

Case 1-18-cv-01100-JL

Peter Macdonald V. Strafford County Superior Court, Judge Nadeau. Judge Howard and
the Town of Lee NH

March 8, 2019

2019 MAR - 8 A
9:38

Cover Letter

This is a request for a Summary Judgment in this case because the uncontested facts warrant such a decision. Submitted this 8th day of March 2019 by Peter Macdonald Plaintiff in this case

Page 1 of 3

Peter Macdonald

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NH
FILED

A 1 court motion

U.S. District Court

District of New Hampshire

2019 MAR - 8 A 9:38

Case # 1-18-cv-01100-JL (Macdonald V. Strafford County Superior Court, Judge Nadeau, Judge Howard and Town of Lee NH

Motion for Summary Judgment in Plaintiff's favor 100% at the soonest possible moment

NOW COMES; the Plaintiff Peter Macdonald a 100% mentally and physically disabled U.S. Military Veteran service connected and so points out to this court that the Defendants in this case have not shown or demonstrated any government need or requirement for their actions in this case to stop Peter Macdonald's religious belief and practice on land zoned for this very purpose. The basic reason stated in the complaint (by the Plaintiff) in case 1-18-cv-01100-JL is that the Defendants spelled Peter Macdonald wrong or used someone else's name completely. The Defendants admitted to fraud and forged documents being submitted to this court. The Defendants admitted to using the wrong name on the response to the Complaint filed by the Plaintiff 1-18-cv-01100-JL meaning no response was ever filed by the Defendants in this case. Fed. R. Civ. P. S. (1)(b), "Failure to deny any allegations in a complaint, constitutes an admission of guilt". The Defendants are claiming the Plaintiff did not use proper procedure in this case, but the Defendants are not following proper procedure themselves by not answering the complaint before they can claim what they are. AS FOLLOWS:

1. The Defendants all know and are aware that the Plaintiff Pro/Se in this case is One Hundred Percent Mentally and Physically disabled and not capable of remembering or following the exact rules of the court. Under the Americans with Disabilities Act the playing field must be made even or the court must allow the mentally disabled Plaintiff latitude in the greatest since in presenting the complaint. The Defendants and this court (in the eyes of any reasonable person) seem to want to hold the Disabled Plaintiff to the exact meaning and intent of the Laws and court rules while allowing the Defendants to violate such rules and laws at their pleasure for they are fellow Judges and Government officials. Example The Defendants are claiming Plaintiff did not follow proper procedure on some technical error that the Plaintiff never filed the proper complaints, while the Defendants did not even answer the Plaintiff's complaint. To not answer the complaint in a timely manner is by law automatic admission of guilt. The Defendants in this case gave up any Right to answer or claim error with their admission of guilt. RLUIPA of 2000, Constitution Separation of Church and State and Fed. R. Civ. P. S. (1)(b)

2. Defendants Nadeau, Howard and the Strafford County Superior Court answered a complaint of Peter McDonald and the court is claiming that they spelled the name wrong. The complaint filed 1-18-cv-01100-JL was a complaint that the wrong name was placed on the Writ of Execution (pulse many other documents for the court). The Defendant's cannot claim that they did not know the correct spelling. The Defendants knowingly answered Peter McDonald's and not Peter Macdonald two entirely different people there for under Fed R. Civ. P. S. (1)(b) the Defendants entered automatic guilty plead

3. That a conflict existed because Judge Nadeau personally knows Peter Macdonald and there for knows how to spell my name correctly. Judge Laplante made the statement (the standard practice of the court is to have a clerk stamp the judges name on the documents) (Judge Nadeau is not even aware of this act) and that is what was done in this case.

Judge Laplante asked each Defendants attorney in this case if that is what has happen. The Defendants attorneys both agreed that is what happened. To knowingly this or any court cannot tolerate claim that a court document with the power of a Judge's signage to inflict harm on any individual is a forgery and this Illegal act is wrong and cannot be tolerated. No one can have the power to use someone else's name on a legal Document and claim it is real as in this case.

4. That the Town of Lee NH spelled Peter MacDonald on the response to the Complaint of the Plaintiff filed on or about December 3rd (on or about) in the year of 2018. The Defendants in this case were told in writing several times the correct spelling of Peter Macdonald (Plaintiff in this case). The reason as stated in complaint 1-18-cv-01100-JI is that the Defendants spelled someone else's name on the Court papers and refuse to recognize the correct person in this case is Peter Macdonald not Peter MacDonald or Peter McDonald. To knowingly use other person's names on complaint response to the court cannot be tolerated. To have this court tell the Plaintiff (as the Defendants want you to) that the Plaintiff has to follow proper procedure then allow the Defendant (because they are judges and other government personal) to claim their mistakes and wrong procedure acts are acceptable constitutes Discrimination and cannot be tolerated.

5. The Government or agents for the U.S. Government can never be allowed to use the power of government to inflict Pain, Suffering and Hardship on any individual or Group of individuals for their own pleasure as in this case. The Plaintiff is legally by Lee NH Zoning Ordinance allowed to have a church on this property at 101 Stepping Stone Rd Lee NH. The Plaintiff in this case has met all Government and court requirements to be a legal church with all the protections of the United States Constitution and this court by law has to accept this truth. The Defendants in this case have not shown reason not to allow a church on this property at 101 Stepping Stone Rd Lee NH. There is NO COMPELLING GOVERNMENT INTREST as required by law. The Substantial Burden of the Defendants in this case on the Religious Practice and Life or Peter Macdonald's Congregation has been heavy on our Religious beliefs, practice and church>. To allow our Government and court to single out individuals, church or others (as shown in this case) is destructive to our Constitution of the United States of America and cannot be tolerated.

Where Fore: The Plaintiff asks this court to understand Peter Macdonald is 100% disabled and that should not be a reason for this court to disregard the Rights so granted every individual by the United States Constitution. Homeless and Disabled Combat U.S. Military Veterans (as in this case) cannot be denied Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness because the Defendants in this case do not want people like us in their community. We the Plaintiff in this case hope and pray that this court accept the Guilty Plead of the Defendants as the law requires and that all requests asked for in this case be granted in full at once.

Respectfully Submitted the 8th day of March 2019
Peter Macdonald

cc Defendants and Attorneys

2062